Dear Dick, gellm 11/27/92

Thinking further this morning, having cooled off a bit, about Livingstone's yesterday's call and his most recent letters of demand and accusation, I think I can reasonably see something in them I should share with you. I do it with the understanding that you will not let him know that I've suggested any such thing because with the state of his mind and my severe limitations I do have to be concerned about what he might do or try to do. Especially because he several times yesterday said, whether or not he meant it literally, that he will kill, his word, his ~~Texas~~ enemies.

When he first started approaching me on his present adventure he was specific in saying it is for a TV documentary he is making with someone in New York. Then in the letter before last he asked my opinion about a short preface a copy of which he enclosed. That is, of course, not for a documentary and is for a book.

As I thought more this early morning about that incredible call yesterday, incredible even for him, it seemed possible that from his references to you and your alleged guidance and as it came out instructions, like telling him to go to the FBI and telling him that what he is being subjected to is criminal slander, he may have unintendely indicated that you are somehow, directly or indicrectly, involved in his current project.

In writing you yesterday I said nothing at all about anything that came up other that his allegations of blackmail against C & G and how my copyright decision and recollections might be of use to you. I wanted to avoid any suggestion that I was in any way intruding. And that is not my present purpose. But there is a new strangeness in this and in his addressing me as his enemy, attacking him, etc. Utter nonsense, of course, and as he volunteered, when he asked me I showed him how to prove the faults of his earlier books, which he actually acknowldeged yesterday. (Like the Zapruder film shows the back of JFK's head was not shot out, as he saw when I directed him to the unquestionable proof. Unless he has a new invention for that, not indicated yesterday.)

In the letter before last he included a copy of a memo, apparently from the files of Paul Rothermel, Jr., quoting what one Sue Fitch allegedly said about me. Other than what she said to me. In the letter I got day before yesterday, perhaps not for the first time, he quotes what I said about the DJ autopsy panel, again supposedly to Rothermel. He did say yesterday, whether or not truthfully when I warned him about Rothermel, not for the first time, that he has a source other than Rothermel for them. And he has several times asked why I helped H.L.Hunt. Who he told me yesterday is a central figure in his "solution" to the crime. I've told him several times my purpose was not to help Hunt but to get help with what I was trying to do to counter what the French CIA was up to beginning with the fake book Farewell America that Harry has decided is the truth, the nittygritty of his Texas plot. (I succeeded through a fluke and without Rothermel's help.)

These are among the things that came to mind in thinking this morning about why in the world he has any interest in my correspondence with Rothermel. That I'd never mentioned to him. Yesterday he volunteered that Rothermel is helping him. He also said an FBI agent was and when I gave him the name, Faris Rookstook III, he said I was correct.

He told me that there is today a vast plot against him and his coming breaking of the case, only him, Dick Daring, that includes most of the critics.

And this did suggest to me why his interest in my letters to Rothermel that clearly had been fed to him in his sick insistence that I am the late H.Hunt's benefactor and sort-of pal if not conspirator.

Or, he visualizes me as part of the vast plot he and he alone can see, against him and by all the critics!

On his own he had no way of knowing that I had any relationship with Rothermel and Hunt or of my letters to Rothermel.

Thinking this way makes sense out of some of what he wrote about what I wrote about the meaning of the report of that DJ autopsy panel that he does not like because it disproves his pet earlier theory, or one of them. That it is factual and correct is immaterial to him. What counts is that it makes his earlier writing very wrong and even though he volunteered the admission that it is he can't abide that.It was in his hands before he did that writing.

I am omitting much. I write this only on the chance that you have some involvement with what he is not up to. And to give you a glimmer of what you have not seen, limited to some of it that seems to be related to me and omitting much more that he told me.

Please keep in mind that I'm not in a position to face any trouble from him and that my sole purpose is to be of possible help to you.

Best to you all,

Harold